DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 890 RC 008 967

AUTHOR Dawson, James I.
TITLE An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of a Leadership Development Program for Rural Lay Leaders in Lawrence County Alabama.
PUB DATE 1 Feb 76
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociology Section of a Meeting of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists (Mobile, Alabama, February 1-4, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Change Agents; *Community Development; Community Involvement; *Community Leaders; Economically Disadvantaged; Heads of Households; Housing Patterns; Hypothesis Testing; Laymen; *Program Evaluation; *Rural Population; School Community Relationship; Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS *Alabama (Lawrence County)

ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of a leadership development program for rural lay leaders on promoting community improvement in Lawrence County, Alabama was evaluated. The sample consisted of 16 disadvantaged rural lay leaders who participated in the 2-month program and 24-month follow-up activities; 60 disadvantaged rural lay leaders who only participated in the follow-up activities, and 200 disadvantaged heads of households. Pre- and post-data were obtained relative to: (1) attitudes toward public school officials and school programs; (2) attitudes toward organizing local community development programs; (3) participation in local community development activities; (4) home ownership; (5) public assistance recipients; and (6) opinions on community quality. Eight null hypotheses tested via community surveys, questionnaires, community attitude inventory, and community solidarity index scale revealed: (1) significant attitude changes among the 16 and the 60 lay leaders relative to public school officials and the school program; (2) a significant attitude change among the 200 heads of households relative to organizing a local community development program; (3) a significant change among the 200 heads of households relative to participation in local community development activities; (4) a significant change in the proportion of the 200 who owned their own home; (5) a significant difference between the mean community solidarity scores. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116890

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of a Leadership Development Program for Rural Lay Leaders in Lawrence County Alabama

James I. Dawson, Alabama A. & M. University, Normal, Alabama 35762

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to measure the effectiveness of a leadership development program for rural lay leaders on promoting community improvement in Lawrence County Alabama. During the leadership development program, emphasis was placed on developing leadership skills of rural lay leaders to enhance their role in community improvement.

A two month (30 clock hours of instruction and discussion) leadership development program and 24 months of follow-up activities were conducted. The data producing sample consisted of 16 disadvantaged rural lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program and follow-up activities; 60 disadvantaged rural lay leaders who did not participate in the leadership development program but participated in the follow-up activities; and 200 disadvantaged head of household persons in four communities in Lawrence County Alabama.

The leadership development program and follow-up activities were the treatment variables. Pre and post data were obtained relative to (1) attitude toward public school officials and school program; (2) attitude toward organizing a local community development program; (3) participation in local community development activities; (4) homeownership; (5) public assistance recipients; and (6) opinions of quality of the community.

The criterion measures in this study were (1) community surveys, (2) questionnaires, (3) community attitude inventory, and (4) community solidarity index scale.

Eight null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. Findings of the study indicated: (1-a) There was a significant change in the attitude held by the 16 lay leaders, who participated in the program, toward public school officials and the school program. (1-b) There was also a significant change in the attitude held by the 60 lay leaders, who did not participate in the leadership development program, toward public school officials and the school program. (1-c) There was no significant change in the attitude held by the 200 head of household persons toward public school officials and the school program. (2-a) The leadership development program showed no significant effect on changing the attitudes held by the 16 lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program toward organizing a local community development program. (2-b) No significant change was found in the attitude held by the 60 lay leaders, who did not participate in the leadership development program, toward organizing a local community development program. (2-c) There was a significant change in the attitudes held by the 200 head of household persons' attitude toward organizing a local community development program. (3) There was a significant change in the proportion of 200 head of household persons who participated in local community development activities. (4) There was a significant change in the proportion of 200 head of household persons who owned their home. (5) There was no significant change in the proportion of 200 disadvantaged head of household persons who received public assistance. (6) There was a significant difference between the mean community solidarity scores.

RC008967

Paper presented at the Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists (SAAS) Meeting, Mobile, Alabama, 1-4 February 1976.

It is recommended that: (1) rural lay leaders be trained and involved in the total community development process to maximize community improvement; (2) an indepth evaluation of leadership development programs for rural lay leaders be conducted to determine if the objectives were achieved; (3) before evaluating the effectiveness of a leadership development program for rural lay leaders, follow-up activities be conducted immediately succeeding the program, and (4) only rural lay leaders who the community citizens have identified be trained and involved to help spearhead the total community development program.

INTRODUCTION

Effective lay leadership is one of the main factors which contributes to the success of a community development program. Regardless to the kind and amount of resources available, without the involvement of lay leaders, community development can not be maximized.

Rural communities, regardless to the socioeconomic level of the people, have a number of prospective leaders. Every citizen is a potential member of a worthwhile community improvement organization, and each participant is a potential leader.

A comprehensive evaluation of a leadership development program is imperative to determine if the objectives were achieved and if not, the reason for failure. The program should be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness in bringing about positive social and economic changes in the community, as a result of group action.

The community development educators are held accountable for developing, conducting and evaluating relevant leadership development programs to enhance the role of rural lay leaders in their effort to improve their community.

Situational Statement

There is a lack of adequate data available relative to various methods and procedures of evaluating leadership development programs. Many leadership development programs have been conducted throughout the United States without being adequately evaluated. Therefore, to what extent the program played in raising the socioeconomic level of the community citizens is unknown.

Most community development educators agree that there is a definite need for using lay leaders to help improve rural depressed communities. Nevertheless, there has not been a significant number of leadership development programs conducted and evaluated for training and educating rural lay leaders.

Scope and Limitation of Study

The geographical area of this study is one county (Lawrence County, Alabama) and is limited to data on 16 disadvantaged rural lay leaders who participated in a leadership development program; 60 disadvantaged lay leaders who did not participate in the program but were involved in the follow-up activities; and 200 disadvantaged head of household members.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Objectives

The general objective of this study was to determine the effectiveness of a leadership development program for rural lay leaders on promoting community improvement in Lawrence County Alabama.

More specifically, the objectives of evaluating the leadership development program were to determine if it had any significant effect on:

1. changing the attitudes (from negative to positive) of disadvantaged lay leaders toward educational programs and community public school officials.

2. changing disadvantaged persons' attitude toward organizing a local community development program.

3. increasing the number of community citizens taking an active part in community development activities.

4. increasing the number of disadvantaged homeowners.

5. decreasing the number of disadvantaged welfare participants.

6. raising the Community Solidarity Index.

Hypotheses

In order to place the problem into a form that would facilitate testing by applying appropriate statistical treatment, the following null hypotheses were tested:

1. As a result of implementing a leadership development program and follow-up activities, there is no significant change, from before to after implementing a leadership development program and follow-up activities, in attitudes held toward public school officials and the school program by:

   a. rural disadvantaged lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program.

   b. rural disadvantaged lay leaders who did not participate in the leadership development program.

   c. rural disadvantages head of household citizens.

2. As a result of implementing a leadership development program and follow-up activities, there is no significant change, from before to after implementing a leadership development program and follow-up activities, in attitudes held toward organizing a local community development program by:

a. rural disadvantaged lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program.

b. rural disadvantaged leaders who did not participate in the leadership development program.

c. rural disadvantaged head of household citizens.

3. There is no significant change in the proportion of community disadvantaged head of household persons taking an active part in community development activities from before to after holding a leadership development program for rural lay leaders and follow-up activities.

4. There is no significant change in the proportion of disadvantaged homeowners from before to after holding a leadership development program for rural lay leaders and follow-up activities.

5. There is no significant change in the proportion of public assistance recipients from before to after holding a leadership development program for rural lay leaders and follow-up activities.

6. There is no significant difference between the mean community solidarity index from before to after holding a leadership development program for rural lay leaders and follow-up activities.

Procedures

Phases of Evaluation

The evaluation of the leadership development program consisted of two phases.

Phase 1 - Phase one consisted of (1) developing instruments, (2) field testing instruments, (3) training personnel to collect pre-data, (4) collecting pre-data, and (5) summarizing pre-data.

Phase 2 - Phase two consisted of (1) collecting post-data, (2) summarizing and analyzing post-data, (3) testing stated null hypotheses, and (4) preparing research report.

The leadership development program and follow-up activities were conducted between phase one and phase two of the study.

The leadership development program consisted of twelve units for discussion.

Several community task force groups were organized by the leaders during the two-year follow-up activities. These small working groups were assigned to work on various specific problems identified by the leaders and other citizens. Each task force group made progress reports at meetings during the follow-up activities.

Various cooperative extension specialists, extension agents, community action personnel and other individuals were used as resource persons, at the request of the leaders during the follow-up activities.

Follow-up Activities

The leadership development program was followed up for 24 months. The purpose of the follow-up program was to further evaluate the effects of the program by observing changes in leadership techniques and strategies used by the 16 lay leaders who participated in the program. The following community organizations were organized during the follow-up program:

County Rural Development Organization. This organization consisted of one representative from various agencies working with rural people, plus a representative number of disadvantaged citizens over a cross-section of the four communities. The purpose of the CRDO was to determine community needs, and develop and implement community development projects based on the needs and interest of the community citizens.

Rural Human Relations Council. The RHRC also consisted of a representative from various agencies in the county plus some rural poor people. The purpose of the RHRC was to develop a better relationship between the races conducive to facilitating community improvement.

Educational Committee. This committee was composed of four educators, a representative from industries in the county, and a disadvantaged person from each section of the county. The purposes of this committee were (1) to aid in the continuous educational progress in the rural schools; (2) to determine continuing education and job training programs needs; (3) aid in ways and means of sponsoring these programs; and (4) to help recruit persons for the programs who needed and could benefit from the instruction.

Industrial Committee. This committee was organized similar to the other committees. The purpose of the Industrial Committee was to study the rural community and look for businessmen who were interested in extending their business into the county. If a company decided to establish a business in the county, the committee would work with company representatives in locating and obtaining a site for the business, and aid in recruiting personnel.

Housing Committee. This committee consisted of lay leaders, professional leaders and other citizens. The purpose of this committee was to locate, motivate and aid qualified low income families in obtaining low cost housing loans. This committee worked closely with county FHA officials and aided them in finding low-income families who qualified for housing loans.

There was a two-year span between the completion of phase one and the beginning of phase two of the project.

Criterion Measures

The criterion measures for this study were (1) community surveys, (2) questionnaires, (3) community attitude scale, and (4) community solidarity index scale.

Sample

The data producing samples consisted of 16 rural lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program; 60 rural lay leaders who did not participate

in the leadership development program but participated in the follow-up activities; and 200 rural disadvantaged head of household members in four communities in Lawrency County Alabama.

The sociometric method was used to identify the lay leaders to ensure that they were selected by their peers.

The 16 lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program came from four of the communities in the county (four leaders from each community). The leaders selected were those persons who had the highest frequency count taken from the reaction of the community citizens as to who they looked to for leadership.

The 60 leaders who did not participate in the leadership development program also represented the four communities but had a lower frequency count than the other 16 leaders.

The 200 head of household members were taken from a cross-section of the four communities in the county.

Collection of Data

Each rural lay leader and head of household member filled out a questionnaire, a community attitude scale and a community solidarity index schedule before and after the leadership development program and follow-up activities were conducted. Pre and post surveys were filled out on each of the four communities represented in the study.

Processing Data

Format sheets were made for transferring the data from the criterion measures to IBM cards, thus enabling the processing of these data by using the computer at Alabama A. & M. University.

Chi square and separate variance t-test were used to test the hypotheses.

ANALYSES OF DATA

Introduction

The data in this study are presented in eight parts. They report the effect of the leadership development program and follow-up activities on:

1. attitudes toward public school officials and school program.
2. attitude toward organizing community development program.
3. participation in community development activities.
4. homeownership.
5. public assistance recipients.
6. community solidarity index.

Attitude

A pre and post community attitude inventory was taken on each of the 16 community leaders who participated in the leadership development program and on the 60 leaders who did not participate in the program. An attitude inventory was also taken on 200 head of household persons from a cross-section of four communities in the county.

The purposes of administering the community attitude inventory were to determine if the leadership development program and follow-up activities had any significant effect on changing the attitude held by the community lay leaders and head of household citizens toward public school officials and the school program, and toward organizing a local community development program.

The participants responded to a 17-item community attitude inventory. The persons could respond to the negative statements one of five ways: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD).

Table 1 shows a X^2 value of 10.12 which indicated that there was a significant change in the attitude held toward public school officials and the school program from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. Hypothesis number 1-a was rejected. Data regarding the attitudes held toward public school officials and school program by the 60 lay leaders, who did not participate in the leadership development program are shown in Table 2. The X^2 value of 8.12 shows that there was a significant change in the attitude held by the 60 community leaders who did not participate in the leadership development program from before to after implementing the program and follow-up activities. Hypothesis number 1-b was also rejected.

Table 1.

Change in 16 Community Leaders' Attitudes Toward Public School Officials and School Program From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	RESPONSES			
	SA&A	U	D&SD	X^2
Attitude Before Program and Follow-up Activities	51	10	35	
				10.12**
Attitude After Progran and Follow-up Activities	33	6	57	
Total	84	16	92	

**Significant at .01 level by chi square test

Table 2.

Change in 60 Community Leaders' Attitudes Toward Public School Officials and School Program From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	RESPONSES			
	SA&A	U	D&SD	X^2
Attitudes Before Program and Follow-up Activities	198	18	144	
				8.12*
Attitudes After Program and Follow-up Activities	235	16	109	
Total	433	34	253	

*Significant at .05 level by chi square test

Data in table 3 shows the attitudes of the 200 head of household persons toward the public school officials and the school program. The X^2 value of 3.50 was not significant at .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number 1-c was accepted.

The community attitudes inventory was also designed to determine if the leadership development program and follow-up activities had a significant effect on changing the attitudes held by community disadvantaged lay leaders and head of household persons toward organizing a local community development program in their respective community.

Data in table 4 show pre and post attitudinal responses of organizing a local community development program by the 16 lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program. The X^2 value of 2.30 is not significant at .05 level which show that there was not a significant change in the attitude held toward organizing a local community development program by the 16 lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program. Hypothesis number 2-a was accepted.

The pre and post responses of the 60 disadvantaged leaders relative to organizing a local community development program are shown in table 5. As shown by the X^2 value of 1.51, there was not a significant change in the attitude held by the leaders toward organizing a local community development program from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. Hypothesis number 2-b was accepted.

The data in table 6 show the responses of the 200 head of household members regarding organizing a local community development program from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. The X^2 value of 10.07 is significant at the .01 level. Hypothesis number 2-c was rejected.

TABLE 3.

Change in 200 Head of Household Persons' Attitude Toward Public School Officials and School Program From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	RESPONSES			
	SA&A	U	D&SD	X^2
Attitude Before Program and Follow-up Activities	1896	120	785	
				3.50
Attitude After Program and Follow-up Activities	1875	150	775	
Total	3770	270	1560	

TABLE 4.

Change in 16 Community Leaders' Attitude Toward Organizing a Local Community Development Program From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	SA&A	U	D&SD	X^2
Attitude Before Program and Follow-up Activities	12	14	150	
				2.30
Attitude After Program and Follow-up Activities	10	8	158	
Total	22	22	308	

Citizen Participation

A pre and post questionnaire was mailed to 280 head of household persons in four communities in Lawrence County Alabama to determine their amount of participation in local community development activities before and after the leadership development program and follow-up activities. The first 200 post questionnaires received from head of household persons who had submitted pre questionnaires were used as the data producing sample.

During the leadership development program, emphasis was placed on how to get citizens to participate in community development activities. Each leader who participated in the program was encouraged to get other leaders and citizens involved in organizing and conducting community development activities.

TABLE 5.

Change in 60 Community Leaders' Attitudes Toward Organizing a Local Community Development Program From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	RESPONSES			
	SA&A	U	D&SD	X^2
Attitude Before Program and Follow-up Activities	202	38	420	
				1.51
Attitude After Program and Follow-up Activities	201	49	410	

TABLE 6.

Change in 200 Head of Household Persons' Attitude Toward Organizing a Local Community Development Program From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	RESPONSES			
	SA&A	U	D&SD	X^2
Attitude Before Program and Follow-up Activities	1076	74	1050	
				10.07**
Attitude After Program and Follow-up Activities	980	65	1155	

**Significant at .01 level by chi square test

The researcher is cognizant relative to the probability of intervening variables that could affect the citizens' participation from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. Nevertheless, it was assumed that since these leaders were selected by the citizens, they would have some influence on getting them to participate in local community development activities.

Data in Table 7 show the number of head of household persons participating in local community development activities from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. The X^2 value of 37.52 is significant at .01 level. Therefore, hypothesis number 3 was rejected.

TABLE 7.

Change in 200 Disadvantaged Head of Household Persons' Participation in Local Community Development Activities From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	RESPONSES			
	Participants	Non-Participants	Total	X^2
Participation Before Program and Follow-up Activities	15	185	200	
				37.52**
Participation After Program and Follow-up Activities	65	135	200	
Total	80	320	400	

**Significant at .01 level by chi square test

Homeownership

The advantages of homeownership was discussed during the leadership development program. The lay leaders were encouraged to conduct a home building and home improvement project in their respective community.

These leaders were asked to work with professional leaders in an effort to increase the number of homeowners among disadvantaged families in their community. Emphasis was placed on FHA low cost housing loans for those persons who qualified.

TABLE 8.

Change in the Number of 200 Head of Household Persons Who Own Their Home From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	Number of Owners	Number of Non-owners	Total	X^2
Homeowners Before Program and Follow-up Activities	65	135	200	
				5.12*
Homeowners After Program and Follow-up Activities	88	112	200	
Total	153	247	400	

*Significant at ,05 level by chi square test

Data in table 8 show the number of disadvantaged families who owned their home from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. The X^2 value of 5.12 is significant at .01 level. Hypothesis number 6 was rejected.

Public Assistance Recipients

It is the consensus among community development educators that many disadvantaged families would not be public assistance recipients if they possess self-pride and try to become self-supported. Therefore, emphasis was also placed on developing self-pride during the leadership development program. The leaders were asked to encourage their peer group to develop a sense of self-pride and find ways and means of getting off public assistance payroll, if possible.

Data in table 9 show the number of disadvantaged head of household persons who were public assistance recipients from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. As shown in table 9, fifteen more families were public assistance recipients after the leadership development program and follow-up activities than before the program and follow-up activities were implemented. The X^2 value of 2.24 is not significant at the .05 level; therefore, hypothesis number 7 was accepted.

TABLE 9.

Change in 200 Disadvantaged Head of Household Public Assistance Recipients From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	Public Assistance Recipients	Non-Public Assistance Recipients	Total	X^2
Recipients Before Program and Follow-up Activities	57	143	200	
				2.24
Recipients After Program and Follow-up Activities	72	128	200	
Total	129	271	400	

Community Solidarity Index

The 76 leaders and 200 head of household members were asked to fill out a pre and post Community Solidarity Index Schedule designed by Miller.[1] The community solidarity index schedule examined six areas of community behavior.

[1] Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Designs and Social Measurement, New York: Davis McKay Company, Inc., pp. 199-201.

They were:

1. Community spirit
2. Interpersonal relations
3. Family responsibility toward the community
4. Schools
5. Churches
6. Economic behavior

These six areas were covered in a series of 27 statements that were rated by the respondents on a five-item scale according to his judgment of how the statements applied to his community. Some statements were in the positive form while others were in a negative form. The respondents reacted to each statement the way he felt that it applied to his community. He could respond to each statement as very true (vt), true (t), not decided (nd), untrue (ut), or definitely untrue (du). Statements in the positive form were scored vt = 1, t = 2, nd = 0, u = 3, and du = 4. Statements in the negative form were scored vt = 4, t = 3, nd = 0, u = 2, and du = 1. Therefore, a small mean indicates a more positive attitude of the quality of the community.

The (pre and post) means were compared for significant difference by using a separate variance t-test. The means were considered an index of the members opinion of the quality of their community. The standard deviation of the scores were taken as a measure of the degree of consensus which is the solidarity in the community. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the solidarity was assumed to have been in the community and vice versa.

TABLE 10.

Means and Standard Deviations of 276 Lay Leaders and Head of Household Persons' Scores Regarding Their Opinion of the Quality of the Community From Before to After Implementing Leadership Development Program and Follow-up Activities

	RESPONSES			
	N	MEAN	S	t-VALUE
Opinion Before Program and Follow-up Activities	276	3.10	2.04	
				7.00**
Opinion After Program and Follow-up Activities	276	2.12	1.02	

**Significant at .01 level by separate variance t-test

The data in table 10 show mean and standard deviation for scores of the 276 respondents (200 head of household persons and 76 leaders) from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. The separate variance t-value of 7.00 is significant at .01 level. The standard deviations of 2.04 and 1.02 also show a greater solidarity index from before to after the program and follow-up activities. Hypothesis number 8 was rejected.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Numerous leadership development programs have been developed and implemented. However, very few attempts have been made to do an indepth evaluation of these program.

Attempts have been made in this study to evaluate the effectiveness of a leadership development program and follow-up activities for rural lay leaders. The major emphasis of the evaluation was to determine if the program and follow-up activities had a significant effect on community improvements.

The criterion measures in this study were (1) Community Survey, (2) Questionnaire, (3) Community Attitude Inventory, and (4) Community Solidarity Index Schedule.

The results and conclusion of this study are presented on succeeding pages.

Attitude

As a result of implementing a leadership development program and follow-up activities, there was a significant change at .01 level in the attitude held toward public school officials and the school program by the 16 rural lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program. The leaders' disagree and strongly disagree (D&SD) responses were significantly higher from before to after the leadership development program and follow-up activities. Evidently, the leadership development program and follow-up activities had a significant effect on bringing about a more positive attitude toward public school officials and the school program. Hypothesis 1-a was rejected.

There was also a significant change, at .05 level, in the attitudes held toward public school officials and the school program by the 60 lay leaders who did not participate in the leadership development program, but participated in the follow-up activities. It was assumed that the 16 leaders from the four communities who participated in the leadership development program involved the other 60 leaders in relevant community development activities which had a significant effect on bringing about a more positive attitude toward public school officials and the school program. Hypothesis number 1-b was rejected.

There was no significant change in the attitudes held by the 200 head of household persons toward public school officials and the school program from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. It is obvious that even with a significant increase in the number of head of household persons participating in community development activities fro before to after the program and follow-up activities (see table 7), their participation had no significant effect on changing their attitude toward public school officials and the school program. Hypothesis number 1-c was accepted.

There was no significant change in the attitude toward organizing a local community development program by the 16 lay leaders who participated in the leadership development program and follow-up activities. However, it should be noted that these persons had a favorable attitude toward organizing a local community development program before and after the program and follow-up activities as shown by the large number of disagree and strongly disagree responses to the negatively statements (see table 4). This seem to indicate that as identified community leaders, these persons were interested in volunteering their services to improve their community before and after the leadership development program and follow-up activities. Therefore, their participation in the leadership development program had no significant effect on their attitude toward organizing a local community development program. Hypothesis 2-1 was accepted.

Likewise, there was no significant change in the attitude toward organizing a local community development program by the 60 lay leaders who did not participate in the leadership development program. As shown by the "disagree" and "strongly disagree" responses in table 5, these leaders also had a positive attitude toward organizing a local community development program both before and after the leadership development program and follow-up activities. Hypothesis number 2-b was also rejected.

There was a significant change, at .01 level, in the 200 head of household persons' attitude toward organizing a local community development program from before to after the leadership development program and follow-up activities. Obviously, the head of household persons' participation in the follow-up activities had a significant effect on their attitude toward organizing a local community development program. Hypothesis number 2-c was rejected.

Citizen Participation

There was a significant change, at .01 level, in the number of 200 disadvantaged head of household persons who participated in local community development activities from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. This indicates that the 16 leaders who participated in the leadership development program had significant influence on getting their followers to participate in local community development activities. Hypothesis number 3 was rejected.

Homeownership

There was a significant change, at .05 level, in the number of the 200 head of household persons who owned their home from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. It was assumed that during the follow-up activities, the 16 lay leaders from the four communities worked with professional leaders, and had significant influence on getting qualified persons to build low cost homes. Hypothesis number 6 was rejected.

Public Assistance Recipients

There was no significant change in the number of 200 disadvantaged head of household persons who recieved public assistance from before to after implementing

the leadership development program and follow-up activities. There was an increase in head of household persons who received public assistance from before to after the program and follow-up activities (see table 9). This increase in the number of disadvantaged public assistance recipients could have been caused by inflation. Hypothesis number 7 was accepted.

Community Solidarity Index

There was a significant difference, at .01 level, between the mean community solidarity scores from before to after implementing the leadership development program and follow-up activities. The smaller standard deviation after the program and follow-up activities also indicated a greater community solidarity, which indicated that the citizens had a more favorable attitude toward the quality of the community and the community effort was facilitated. Hypothesis number 8 was rejected.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Community improvement can not be maximized without participation of the community citizens. In order to get maximum citizen participation, rural lay leaders must be involved in the total community development process. If these lay leaders are to be effective in their effort to aid in helping to improve their community, they must understand certain basic principles of leadership and the community development process. Therefore, community development educators should develop and implement leadership development training programs for rural lay leaders that will enhance their role in community development.

An indepth evaluation of leadership development programs for rural lay leaders should be conducted to determine if the objectives were achieved, and if not, why?

Before an attempt is made to evaluate the effectiveness of a leadership development program, follow-up activities should be conducted immediately succeeding the program. These activities should be designed to provide practical experience in leadership and in the steps of the community development process. These experiences should be centered around the units or subjects discussed during the training program.

All follow-up activities should be designed in measurable form. That is, the results of the leaders' and citizens' effort should be capable of being measured, quantitative and/or qualitative.

If the effectiveness of the evaluation is to be maximized, bench mark data must be collected before the leadership development program and follow-up activities are implemented. Likewise, post data must be collected at the end of the follow-up activities.

There must be sufficient time between collecting pre and post data for the treatment variables, leadership development program and follow-up activities, to act upon the criterion variables which are to be measured.

Since citizens in each rural community have an identified number of influential lay leader whose leadership they will follow, community development educators should place more emphasis on developing and implementing relevant leadership development programs for this group of leaders.

In-as-much as most rural lay leaders have a limited amount of formal education, the leadership development program materials should not be beyond their educational level, and the follow-up activities should be within their level of accomplishment.